

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Randy Morris Fuewell, # 279287,)	C/A No. 4:12-1004-RBH-TER
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
Lt. J. Thompson;)	
Lt. Willie Briscoe;)	
Lt. Donald Gilchrist;)	
Dr. Kosher;)	ORDER
Dr. Koon;)	
Director Joyce L. Young;)	
Jennifer Franklin;)	
Sgt. Cook;)	
Capt. Joseph Stevens;)	
Ida Culbreath;)	
Lt. Harmon;)	
Stephanie Marshall, Lt.;)	
V. Aikens, Lt.;)	
A. Reid, Cpl.;)	
Sgt. Moss;)	
Terry Andrews, HCA, and)	
T. James, Nurse,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on numerous motions filed by the Plaintiff. Each motion will be addressed separately.

Plaintiff filed a motion on March 11, 2013, entitled “ Motion for Understanding.” (Doc. #117). In this motion, Plaintiff appears to be complaining that he received an envelope in the mail while housed at Kershaw Correctional Institution when it was mailed to him at McCormick Correctional Institution where he was previously housed and that his mail was opened and tampered

with because someone stamped it received before sending it to him at Kershaw Correctional Institution. Plaintiff does not seek any relief. In any event, this is not a proper motion under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the motion (Doc. #117) is DENIED.

Plaintiff filed a motion on March 11, 2013, entitled “Motion for Freedom of Information/ Privacy Acts Request.” (Doc. #119). In this motion, Plaintiff appears to be seeking copies of documents in his case and a copy of the “Federal Rules and Regulations for your Agency.” Id. Defendants filed a response in opposition asserting that it is unclear to whom the motion is directed and the proper manner to obtain materials is through the discovery process as set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Additionally, Defendants assert that if Plaintiff was allowed to request materials from the Defendants under the Freedom of Information Act, his request is objectionable and he would be required to pay costs associated with his request. (Doc. # 134).

This court is not the proper forum to address requests under the “Freedom of Information Act” in the context of this case. If Plaintiff seeks discovery in this case, he should do so pursuant to the Local Rules, D.S.C., and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

On May 9, 2013, and June 3, 2013, Plaintiff filed motions entitled “Motions to Compel.” (Docs. # 155 and #170). Defendants filed responses in opposition asserting that Plaintiff has not served them with discovery requests. (Docs. # 157, 163, and #165). As Plaintiff has not complied with Local Civil Rule 37.01(B), D.S.C. requiring the attachment of relevant discovery requests and responses served, these motions (doc. #155 and #170) are DENIED

On May 17, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion entitled “Motion for Appeal.” (Doc. #161). Defendants filed a response in opposition to this motion. (Docs. # 162 and #167). In this document, it is unclear what Plaintiff is attempting to “appeal.” The motion does not reference any particular

rulings from this court and there does not appear to be a final order to which it could pertain in the docket. Therefore, this motion (Doc. # 161) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

October 1, 2013
Florence, South Carolina